

MINUTES of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 13 October 2021 at Surrey County Council, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

Members Present:

Tim Hall (Chairman)
Ernest Mallett MBE
Penny Rivers
Jeffrey Gray
Jonathan Hulley
Victor Lewanski
David Lewis
Catherine Powell
Jeremy Webster (Vice-Chairman)
David Harmer (as substitute)

Apologies:

Scott Lewis
Richard Tear

31/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Richard Tear and Scott Lewis. David Harmer substituted for Richard Tear.

32/21 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

The Minutes were APPROVED as an accurate record of the previous meeting.

Mr Mallet asked for an update on an action agreed at a previous meeting which was to provide paper copies of the National Planning Policy Framework and Minerals and Waste Policy documents to Members at Woodhatch Place. Officers confirmed that a Members' library of key documents was in the process of being made available and that an update would be provided outside the meeting.

33/21 PETITIONS [Item 3]

There were none.

34/21 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]

There were none.

35/21 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

There were none.

36/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]

Catherine Powell declared a non-pecuniary interest as she was a member of the Community Liaison Group for the Runfold South Quarry site.

37/21 MINERALS/WASTE WA/2021/01282 - LAND AT RUNFOLD SOUTH QUARRY, GUILDFORD ROAD, RUNFOLD, FARNHAM, SURREY GU10 1PB [Item 7]

The Chairman agreed to discuss the four applications (Item 7, 8, 9 & 10) under item 7.

Officers:

Stephen Jenkins, Planning Development Manager
 Caroline Smith, Planning Group Manager
 Helen Forbes, Senior Lawyer

Speakers:

The Local Member for Farnham Central, Andy Macleod, spoke for three minutes and made the following points:

- SUEZ Recycling and Recovery UK had consistently failed to meet target dates and then applied for extensions and that officers and Members should make clear to SUEZ that this was not acceptable.
- That the extension to the expected completion date was too long and in contrary in the council's policy.
- That SUEZ seemed to be focused on maximising profits and had no plan to complete the works by the earliest possible date.
- That in November 2019, SUEZ had assured the Community Liaison Group (CLG) that restoration by December 2021 was still achievable and then, two months later in January 2020, SUEZ announced that restoration was no longer achievable in 2021.
- That there was no detailed schedule which outlined why a four year extension was required.
- That the condition for six-month updates was welcomed however a condition was needed to provide a schedule which clearly showed where works were against a base plan.
- That the condition to extend the aftercare period was welcomed by the community as well as the increase in bio-diversity however there was disappointment that guidance on the meadow was not followed.
- That the above comments applied to all four of the applications

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Officers introduced the report and provided a brief summary. Members noted that the applications reported to this committee were all seeking an extension of time for completion of restoration for a period of four years. Officers also highlighted that objections had been received from resident groups and the town council. Members noted further detail on

the applications, including references to site plans, which were outlined within the reports.

2. A Member stated that there was a need to restore the site and that market conditions for filling material, as well as the availability of Heavy Goods Vehicles and drivers, needed to be taken into consideration. The Member further stated that the enforcement team would monitor the site on the Committee's behalf. The Member also felt that a four year extension was appropriate to complete the works and may prevent the need for further extensions.
3. A Member said that it was concerning that the applicant was unable to meet the original timescale and asked whether conditions could be implemented to ensure there were no further delays.
4. The Committee discussed the need for a detailed schedule for the site's works which allowed for proper monitoring and accountability and that, once created, should be shared with the Community Liaison Group and Technical Support Group.
5. A Member raised the possibility of alternative solutions to filling such as reducing infilling or creating a lake and community water sports centre on the site.
6. Following discussion related to issues across the county regarding lack of materials for infilling, officers confirmed that the council's Minerals and Waste Plan was due to begin consultation in the coming months and that, with this, was an opportunity to revise policy to take into account when less material was available for infilling. The Committee agreed to write a note to the Chairman of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee outlining concerns to be considered as part of the development of the Plan.
7. The Committee noted a clarification that the end date for the restoration was originally 31 December 2021.
8. The Chairman asked that any updated conditions be made available on the Surrey County Council website.
9. In regard to Condition 32, a Member asked whether the wording could be amended to include that the existing biodiversity baseline be from a survey completed within the following six months. Officers stated that they were guided by specialist officers and that it was officers opinion that the baseline be set following the completion of restoration. The Committee agreed to review the wording with the Environmental Enhancement Officer.
10. The Committee felt that the detail in the report was not correctly reflected within the conditions. In regard to Condition 34 , A Member suggested that the conditions be amended to not only include infilling but also progressive restoration.
11. Following the end of the discussion, the Chairman clarified the following points:
 - a. That Condition 32 be reviewed by an Environmental Enhancement Officer to consider whether the biodiversity baseline should be set within the next six months or following restoration.
 - b. That Condition 34 be amended to include reference to a schedule of works and report. The schedule would also to be shared with the Community Liaison Group and Technical Sub-Group.
 - c. That the detail outlined within paragraphs 72 and 73 of the report be reflected within the schedule of works and that references to the detail were included within the appropriate

conditions. This should also include reference to progressive restoration.

Resolved:

The Committee agreed to **PERMIT** planning application ref: **WA/2021/01282** subject to the conditions from page 31, amended conditions and the update sheet.

38/21 MINERALS/WASTE WA/2021/01283 - LAND AT RUNFOLD SOUTH QUARRY, GUILDFORD ROAD, RUNFOLD, FARNHAM, SURREY GU10 1PB [Item 8]

Resolved:

The Committee agreed to **PERMIT** planning application ref: **WA/2021/01283** subject to the conditions from page 71, amended conditions and the update sheet.

39/21 MINERALS/WASTE WA/2021/01284 - LAND AT RUNFOLD SOUTH QUARRY, GUILDFORD ROAD, RUNFOLD, FARNHAM, SURREY GU10 1PB [Item 9]

Resolved:

The Committee agreed to **PERMIT** planning application ref: **WA/2021/01284** subject to the conditions from page 111, amended conditions and the update sheet.

40/21 MINERALS/WASTE WA/2021/01285 - LAND AT RUNFOLD SOUTH QUARRY, GUILDFORD ROAD, RUNFOLD, FARNHAM, SURREY GU10 1PB [Item 10]

Resolved:

The Committee agreed to **PERMIT** planning application ref: **WA/2021/01285** subject to the conditions from page 151, amended conditions and the update sheet.

41/21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]

The date of the next meeting was noted as 17 November 2021.

Meeting closed at 11.45 am

Chairman